REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated December 29, 2006, having a shortened statutory period set to expire March 29, 2007. Applicant requests a one-month Extension of Time, and has submitted herewith the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.17 to extend the period for response to **April 29, 2007**. Proposed amendments include **amending** the Abstract in accordance with the Examiner's objection, **amending** Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-20, 22-25, 27 and 29-31. Upon entry of the proposed amendments, Claims 1-32 remain pending.

Objection to the Abstract

In paragraph 2 of the present Office Action, the Abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is more than one paragraph. In response, Applicants have amended the Abstract to reduce it to one paragraph in accordance with MPEP §608.01(b).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In paragraph 4 of the present Office Action, Claims 29-31 are rejected under 37 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended Claims 29-31 to define a <u>tangible, computer-readable</u> medium in order to place Claims 29-31 in statutory form, thereby overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

In paragraph 6 of the present Office Action, Claims 1, 6-10, 15-16, 20-24 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hama et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,177 – "*Hama*"). In paragraph 8 of the present Office Action, Claims 2-5 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Hama* in view of *Keren et al.* (U.S. Patent No.: 6,335,733 – "*Keren*"). In paragraph 9 of the present Office Action, Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hama* in view of *Bates et al.* (U.S. Patent No.: 5,377,314 – "*Bates*"). In paragraph 10 of the present Office Action, Claims 12-14 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hama* in view

of *Bates* and further in view of *Frank et al.* (U.S. Patent No.: 5,651,107 – *"Frank"*). In light of the present amendments, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With regard to exemplary **Claim 1**, *Hama* does not teach or suggest, "storing a model of a graphic object, wherein said model includes an indication of whether said graphic object is a parent or child of another graphic object", as supported in the present specification at p. 16, lines 14-21. *Hama* does not teach or suggest, "displaying to a user a list of overlapping graphic objects which coincide with said pointer position and on which said graphics editing operation can be performed", as supported in the present specification at p. 17, lines 24-24 and step **104** of **FIG. 2**. *Hama* teaches displaying "a subscreen in which information relating to all selective candidates is displayed" (col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 1). *Hama* does not teach or suggest, "detecting a selection by the user of one graphic object of said indicated plurality of overlapping graphic objects as a target graphic object without the user changing said pointer position to make said selection", as disclosed in the present specification at p. 12, lines 17-21. *Hama* teaches, "the operator sequentially changes the display state of the edit object by suitably moving the pointer" (col. 4, lines 66-67).

With regard to exemplary Claim 2, the cited art (*Hama* in view of *Keren*) does not teach or suggest, "a user-defined area of said display described by the motion of said pointer in response to said user dragging an input device", as supported in the present specification at p. 19, lines 24-25.

With regard to exemplary Claim 8, *Hama* does not teach or suggest, "continuously displaying to the user a hover window listing said graphic objects which are coincident with said pointer position and continuously updating said hover window in response to changes in said pointer position", as supported in the present specification at p. 13, lines 16-19.

With regard to exemplary Claims 9 and 10, *Hama* does not teach or suggest a graphics editing operations comprising adding text to the target object. Furthermore, *Hama* does not teach or suggest adding text by, "opening a text box on said target graphic object; displaying a text insertion cursor in said text box to display the location where new text will be inserted; and ending said graphic operation in response to the user moving said pointer to a position outside of said text box

and depressing a control button on an input device", as supported in the present specification at p. 15, line 12 to p. 16, line 4.

With regard to exemplary Claim 13, the cited art (*Hama* in view of *Bates* in further view of *Frank*) does not teach or suggest, "making the selected target graphic object visible comprises temporarily making said <u>parent</u> graphic object transparent <u>in response to making said child graphic object transparent</u>", as supported in the present specification at p. 17, lines 7-16. The disclosure cited by Examiner in *Frank* discusses making windows in a GUI transparent by alpha-blending. But the cited disclosure contains to teaching or suggestion of making a parent graphic object transparent in response to making its child transparent, as required by Claim 13. In fact, *Frank* has no teaching or suggestion of parent-child object relationships.

All remaining claims depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 16, 28, 30 or 32. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that all claims are allowable in view of the Examiner's cited references for the reasons adduced above, as well as for their own limitations.

<div align="center">

CONCLUSION

</div>

As the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims, Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Applicants now request a one-month Extension of Time for filing of the present Amendment. Furthermore, Applicant submits herewith the fee for a one-month extension of time. No additional fee is believed to be required. If, however, any additional fees are required for the prosecution of the present patent application, please charge those fees to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 09-0447**.

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Boice
Registration No. 44,545
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)